1	some action on your earlier request for
2	whatever you are requesting, basically
3	approval of a license
4	MR. CATALANO: It would be
5	approval of the individual licenses.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I understand.
7	MR. CATALANO: and within the
8	context of Second Thursday, we would meet the
9	standards. No wrongdoer is being benefitted.
10	The value is There is no excess value, and
11	there was a good faith finding by the court.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now hear me. Maybe
13	I am not making myself clear. There are two
14	questions. There is the question of the
15	overall application of Second Thursday to this
16	particular situation. The situation requires
17	bankruptcy approval of a plan.
18	So the plan comes into it.
19	Valuation is in the plan. All that has to be
20	looked at. You want your license situation
21	segregated from that, because and you made
22	a good point basically, it has already been

cleared by the Bankruptcy Court.

Whatever the relief is that you are seeking from the Commission -- I believe you have something pending up here, don't you, either as an individual or as a group? Have you gone to the Commission at all?

MR. CATALANO: What is pending is the reconsideration that all the applicants are in requesting the Commission to transfer the license. That is pending, that issue, but that is a separate track to get the license transferred, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: What I am saying is that I don't think that you are absolutely left without a remedy, but how successful the remedy would be -- and the remedy would be to seek some kind of -- I wanted to say emergency, but some kind of immediate relief from the Commission on the basis of what you have laid out, and try to expedite the request for reconsideration that way or something like that. But there is nothing. I can't start

1	piecing it out that way, because I know it is
2	going to just be sent right back to me. I am
3	sure it will be.
4	So it is all or nothing here, as
5	far as Second Thursday is concerned, unless
6	the designation were to change, unless I am
7	directed to do otherwise. And I am not trying
8	to hold it back. I am trying to get in the
9	position where it is put together so that it
10	is not going to come back to me.
11	MR. ZDEBSKI: Your Honor, may I
12	add in?
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, please. Your
L4	name again? I know you are from Duquesne.
L5	MR. ZDEBSKI: Charlie Zdebski for
L6	Duquesne Light. The Enforcement Bureau has
17	been pushing to move ahead in this proceeding
L 8	and has questioned what has gone on in the
L 9	Bankruptcy proceeding, including the valuation
20	and the process of approval.
21	One way for the Enforcement Bureau
22	to get that information and to be involved in

the valuation question is to participate in a 1 I think, as Mr. bankruptcy proceeding. 2 Catalano said before, they have the right to 3 If I were the Enforcement Bureau, I do it. 4 guess I would avoid doing it, too, so that I 5 could take a second bite at it when it comes 6 7 back here, but that is holding up the process. We have people who are testifying, 8 being deposed, and 9 people who are valuation issue is squarely before 10 Bankruptcy Court and will be decided there. 11 The Enforcement Bureau is deciding it will 12 wait to come back here and then look at it in 13 14 the context of Second Thursday. So we have proposed a creative 15 solution to get our applicants with a need for 16 licenses for critical infrastructure out of 17 this situation, and what the Enforcement 18 Bureau is proposing is going to hold up the 19 20 process even longer. The Enforcement JUDGE SIPPEL: 21 Bureau is just doing its job. There is all 22

kinds of reasons why the Bureau decision -the prosecutory discretion of the Bureau would
be whether or not to try and -- First of all,
it has to move to appear in the bankruptcy
proceeding. I am not sure s a Judge that
bankruptcy judge would particularly like
getting that message, and that is a management
decision in the discretion of the Bureau or
the Commission, not me.

So talk to Ms. Kane, but I don't think -- Well, I have said as much as I can.
I can't do anything for you here.

MS. KANE: Your Honor, I think we have been extremely active in trying to move this case forward in this hearing, in this forum, which is where we are a party, and I think we find it offensive that we are now being accused of somehow trying to hold up this hearing and this process, because we are not participating for some prosecutorial reason or management decision as a Commission, because it is not the Enforcement Bureau that

would make an appearance in front of the Bankruptcy Court. It would be the Commission, and that is a totally different entity than us -- and that we are somehow trying to hold up the process here by not participating there.

The reality is that there are overlapping issues between the two, because of the fact that there is a bankruptcy proceeding, and Maritime intends to seek Second Thursday treatment.

There is an overlapping series of issues, which is why, if you recall, Your Honor, you allowed certain discovery concerning the valuation and concerning at least some identification of who the creditors were as part of this hearing process during our last prehearing conference in October.

Now with regard to that, we did get some of the valuation information, but we did not get what we thought we were going to get, which was an identification of not only who the creditors were, but what their

1	relationships were to Maritime. How did they
2	become creditors? What is their Why was it
3	that they lent money to Mr. DePriest? What is
4	their relationship, their personal
5	relationship or professional relationship with
6	the at least named wrongdoers, in order to
7	determine whether or not some of these
8	innocent creditors are, in fact, not innocent
9	for the very purposes of Second Thursday?
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: What kind of
11	discovery are you going to need for that? Are
12	you going to depose all these creditors?
13	MS. KANE: We would like at some
14	point at least to be deposing the Maritime
15	principals, but obviously, we don't want to do
16	that piecemeal. So since Your Honor has
17	allowed discovery to go forward on Issue G and
18	at least some limited amount of discovery that
19	was related to Second Thursday as part of our
20	last prehearing conference, we wanted to have
21	a single deposition and try to keep all these
22	depositions together. But since we have no

1	movement yet on Issue G discovery, we haven't
2	been able to pursue discovery of Maritime
3	principals on some of these other issues as
4	well.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, you are
6	trying to shoehorn Issue G discovery into the
7	bigger picture, seems to me.
8	MS. KANE: Well, I am not trying
9	to shoehorn it, Your Honor. It is a separate
10	issue, but the reality is that I have no
11	doubt, if we tried to take multiple
12	depositions of Mr. DePriest, either on Issue
13	G and/or on issues that might relate to the
14	Second Thursday, that they would put up some
15	sort of objection to that.
16	So we were trying to get all of
17	our discovery ducks in a row before we deposed
18	some of these witnesses.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: To play that down,
20	we could offer them a deal, either two for
21	nothing. You can answer questions about the
22	whole schmeer, the whole thing, or you are

going to get questions on just Issue G. It is 1 2 up to you. It is up to the Maritime parties 3 whether or not they want to run the risk of being hit with double depositions. I don't 4 5 know. If it is a question of money from 6 7 the standpoint of the Bureau's efficiency, then I am afraid you are going to have to 8 9 wait. I am not sure what the answer to that 10 is, but I am not going to give you relief on 11 that basis alone. If you want to take a 12 deposition from somebody at Maritime on the 13 issue of Issue G, I have no problem with 14 granting that, permission to do that. 15 MS. KANE: No, I understand that, 16 Your Honor, but we have no discovery yet on 17 Issue G. So it wasn't prudent to go forward with a deposition on those issues until that 18 19 discovery is in front. JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand. 20 I 21 didn't mean to say that that is what you

should be doing. I am simply saying that is

the -- Now what discovery is needed on Issue 1 2 G that you haven't already undertaken? have already undertaken it, but you haven't 3 gotten the answers? 4 MS. KANE: We have --5 As you 6 recall in the last prehearing conference, we have worked with Mr. Havens and we worked with 7 their counsel to provide Your Honor with a 8 joint motion for discovery on Issue G. 9 included a series of document requests and 10 11 interrogatories. 12 We filed that, I believe, sometime in early December. You had asked to approve 13 that discovery before maritime would 14 15 respond to it. Now in December Maritime 16 objected to the discovery not in its scope, 17 but only to the fact that apparently Mr. 18 Havens was seeking similar discovery in other forums. But in that pleading, Maritime said 19

They have not provided it in absence of an order from Your Honor.

they were willing to provide the information.

20

21

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
2	Consider that done. You have an order.
3	Maritime has an order to proceed with giving
4	the Bureau everything they have asked for that
5	is not objected to. Just do it, but I will
6	get an order out on that today or tomorrow.
7	That is a failure on my part. I understand.
8	I have been preoccupied, though.
9	MS. KANE: And we understand that,
10	Your Honor. The other issue
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I even had a
12	friend's funeral I had to go to yesterday.
13	MS. KANE: Oh, I am sorry about
14	that.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, this is how
16	things happen, you know.
17	MS. KANE: Well, that prompted our
18	motion to extend the deadline, which was last
19	Friday, for the discovery deadline for Issue
20	G, and I think now we are at a point, Your
21	Honor, where we need to set a new discovery
22	deadline for the Issue G discovery, both of

1	Maritime and Pinnacle Wireless, which you have
2	added in as a party, and maybe any other
3	parties who may have information. We don't
4	know yet, because we haven't received
5	discovery from Maritime as to whether any of
6	the other parties in the hearing may have
7	relevant discovery relevant to Issue G.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Any other parties
9	in this proceeding?
10	MS. KANE: They may.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Have you asked
12	them?
13	MS. KANE: Well, no, we haven't,
14	Your Honor. We served discovery on parties
15	with regard to very basic information early in
16	this case, and they have refused to respond to
17	that. So we hadn't proceeded with other party
18	discovery until we got discovery from
19	Maritime.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, wait a
21	minute. I am not talking about that. I am
22	talking about Do you have reason to believe

1	that any of these parties being represented
2	here, you know, the assignment parties I
3	don't know what you want to call them that
4	they have some knowledge about Issue G?
5	MS. KANE: I personally don't,
6	Your Honor, because we have nothing to
7	indicate that, but then again we did not know
8	that Pinnacle Wireless would have discovery.
9	They weren't even a party to this case until
LO	they moved for intervention.
L1	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is a whole new
L2	ballgame, but they have explained exactly why.
L3	They have got a good reason.
L4	MS. KANE: Agreed, Your Honor.
L5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've got to be able
L6	to safely get up and down the Jersey Turnpike,
L7	you know.
L8	MS. KANE: Agreed, Your Honor, but
19	we have basically been on hold waiting for
20	Maritime to respond to the discovery on Issue
21	G, and that
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I want to

1 move that along. I told you that. MS. KANE: I understand that. We 2 assume that will inform our decisions going 3 4 forward in terms of discovery of other either parties or nonparties. 5 MR. HAVENS: Some of the parties 6 7 are buying site based licenses. JUDGE SIPPEL: Say that again. 8 9 MR. HAVENS: Your Honor, some of 10 the applicants' parties are purchasing site based licenses. In regard to site based 11 12 licenses, therefore, they should 13 information on what they are purchasing. JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see what you 14 15 are saying. Let me just ask the question in general. Does anybody -- Do any of these 16 17 applicant assignment parties have 18 information on Issue G? Do you know what Issue G is? 19 It is basically -- It was 20 construction of a particular location. getting quizzical looks to denials, shaking 21

heads.

I could get something added to my
order and say that they have an obligation to
come forward if they have any information on
that issue, but again I don't want to start
poking around without having a basis for doing
it on fact finding.
Pinnacle should be able to give a
lot of information to you. They laid it out.
MS. KANE: That is only on two of
the site based licenses, Your Honor. There
are other licenses that are at issue in the
construction.
JUDGE SIPPEL: IN the Issue G
issue?
MS. KANE: In the Issue G issue.
I believe there is something like eight or
nine site based licenses at issue, as to
whether or not they have been constructed
and/or discontinued.
MR. HAVENS: I believe all of them
are subject to Issue G. There is no
limitation stated on that in the hearing

1 designation order, and there are site based 2 licenses throughout the country. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: is Mr. Havens 4 I am talking to the court reporter. 5 Well, there has got to be a better 6 way to get at this than what we are talking about here, but there has got to be some 7 8 specification worked out. I would ask the 9 Bureau to undertake that as soon as they 10 reasonably can. 11 What I am talking about is narrow 12 down exactly who you have reason to believe 13 something about knows this issue, 14 certainly the site -- any site based location 15 that is alleged to be a venue for a construction violation, whatever you want to 16 17 call it, would be the most logical place, and 18 Pinnacle can start its discovery if they are 19 participating for that purpose, or Pinnacle 20 can give you -- Have you interviewed Pinnacle 21 at all?

MS. KANE:

22

We haven't yet, Your

1	Honor. We were waiting until you made them a
2	party last week. So we are
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are a party.
4	MS. KANE: I understand. We are
5	in the process of preparing written discovery
6	for Pinnacle, and we expect them to be able to
7	produce that information.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is perfectly
9	proper for them to You need to pick up the
10	phone and talk to the attorneys, talk to the
11	principals, you know, if the attorney agrees,
12	and get as much information that way as you
13	can, but certainly proceed with the discovery.
14	But they seem to be willing to They seem
15	to be very willing to cooperate with you.
16	MS. KANE: They have been, Your
17	Honor.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go to it.
19	MR. PLACHE: Your Honor, just to
20	clarify. Matthew Plache speaking for
21	Pinnacle.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you.

1	MR. PLACHE: There is one license,
2	one site based license, that Pinnacle leases
3	from Maritime, and it is station WRV 374.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Station RV?
5	MR. PLACHE: I think it is WRV
6	374.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: As in Victor?
8	MR. PLACHE: 374.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Where is that
10	located?
11	MR. KELLER: Has multiple sites.
12	MR. PLACHE: Multiple sites, yes.
13	MR. HAVENS: That is the Atlantic
14	Coast multiple station license.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Multiple sites on
16	the Atlantic coast?
17	MR. HAVENS: Yes, sir.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay, thank you,
19	Mr. Havens.
20	MR. PLACHE: Our understanding is
21	Maritime does have a lot of other site based
22	licenses, and Maritime has information on the

1	construction of the licenses as well. But
2	Pinnacle does have information on what it has
3	done with this particular license.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: But there is a lot
5	more. There is a lot more than just what
6	Pinnacle knows.
7	MR. PLACHE: I can't speak for
8	Maritime, but
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, no, I am not
L O	thinking about Maritime, but I mean there are
.1	other sites out there that you really don't
.2	have information on.
.3	MR. PLACHE: Other stations that
.4	Pinnacle does not have an interest in.
.5	JUDGE SIPPEL: So you would have a
.6	lesser amount of information on those,
.7	obviously, if any.
.8	MR. PLACHE: I would probably have
.9	as much as maybe less than the Enforcement
0.0	people.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Would you be
2	willing to have one of your principals sit

1	down with Bureau counsel and
2	MR. PLACHE: Absolutely. We
3	would like to do that, and I will arrange it
4	with Ms. Kane.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Fine.
6	MR. PLACHE: We are willing and
7	happy to cooperate.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am going to
9	assume that that is being undertaken, and then
10	is that satisfactory to you now as a starter,
11	obviously?
12	MS. KANE: Absolutely, Your Honor.
13	We were planning on starting that. Obviously,
14	we would like to also know what the general
15	timeline is for us to obtain all of this
16	discovery.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that is what
18	I am going to
19	MR. MR. KELLER: Your Honor,
20	excuse me. May I? Before we get on to the
21	general timeline, I just wanted to say a

1 things about this issue, which is responding 2 to the outstanding discovery request. Ms. Kane is correct. We did state 3 4 in our filing that we were prepared to move 5 forward on Issue G and would respond to the 6 discovery request upon the order of We stated in there that we were 7 Honor. 8 prepared to respond to those requests within 9 10 days of the order. That is the time for I think the other one 10 one form of discovery. 11 has 14 days, but to show good faith, we are 12 going to give them the four days. 13 So I am assuming your order will 14 be out today or tomorrow. So it will be 10 15 days from today that we would be doing that. She also said we did not object to 16 17 the scope of the discovery. That is accurate. 18 I just want to make one thing clear, so that 19 nobody is sort of caught off quard. 20 While we will be fully responding 21 to all the questions, it is going to be 22 subject to a caveat. We are going to suggest

1 that a lot of these site based licenses are 2 subsumed within geographic licenses, and we believe that, therefore, that sort of moots 3 4 the issue. 5 We can explain all that later, but my point is we are not going to withhold 6 7 discovery on that basis, but we are going to be stating up front as a caveat that we are 8 not, in providing the discovery, conceding 9 that issue. 10 11 Then finally, an issue that I 12 wanted to bring up, because again I don't want this to come as a surprise after the hearing. 13 14 One of the things the Commission requested 15 with a document request were all documents relating to this. 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: The Commission or 17 18 the Bureau? The Bureau. 19 MR. KELLER: I'm 20 sorry, the Bureau asked. That is on of the 21 things in the discovery request, a request for 22 production of documents.

We have documents, at least 12 boxes of documents that are all the documents relating to the facilities. These include construction information, site drawings, leases, all that sort of thing. But as I say, that alone, just those call sign files alone, took up 12 boxes which we managed to get here from Indiana, but it would cost us at least \$8,000 and probably more -- we got an estimate -- to scan in one copy -- you know, just to scan in, have it scanned in for some sort of, I don't know. It would cost much more than that to make multiple paper copies.

My interpretation of the discovery rule is that we are required to make items available for inspection and copying. So what we are going to do is we will make those documents available. We got them to Washington.

They are here in Washington. We will make them available for inspection, but Maritime literally -- I mean absolutely

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	literally does not have the money to make
2	copies and, even if it did, I am not sure that
3	we could expend \$10,000 for something like
4	that without court approval, Bankruptcy Court
5	approval.
6	So we are going to make them
7	available. We have managed to get them here
8	to Washington for that purpose, but we are not
9	equipped to make copies of them.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are they in your
11	offices?
12	MR. KELLER: Right now they are in
13	the office of a copy center in downtown who is
14	holding them for us to wait to see what we are
15	deciding to do. We had them delivered to
16	it is called
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: That is okay. You
18	don't have to tell me exactly. Let me just
19	ask you this, both counsel. If those
20	documents were in your custody, in your firm's
21	custody, you have a conference room of some

kind?

1	MR. KELLER: Well, not that we can
2	That is why we took them to the copy
3	center, because it is a huge amount of
4	documents, and we put them there, figuring
5	that way, if people want to make copies, they
6	are right there at the copy center.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, I see.
8	MR. KELLER: They are in like a
9	little room or an office at the copy center.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, what kind of
11	a facility do they have that you can examine
12	documents?
13	MR. KELLER: They have the ability
14	to be examined there. There is a couple of
15	desks or something. I mean, I have been in
16	there.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: They do?
18	MR. KELLER: Yes. I have been in
19	there a couple of times to go through them
20	myself.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Is it in
22	Washington, D.C.?